

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Official Action dated May 22, 2003, which has been made FINAL, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,365 to Tamir ("Tamir"). Applicants' respectfully traverse the aforementioned §102(b) rejection in view of the amendments and remarks to follow hereinbelow.

Particularly, Claims 1 and 10 of the present invention are being amended for clarification purposes to more accurately and definitively set forth the invention. In particular, Claims 3 and 4 are being canceled and the subject matter thereof is being incorporated into independent method Claim 1 and corresponding system Claim 10. These independent Claims 1 and 10 are now directed to a system and method for enabling access to video contents by using the trajectory of an object, the trajectory of an object being displayed separately from a video image and used to efficiently specify and display a video image scene desired by a user. The claims have been amended to set forth the concurrent display of a play advantage scale for representing an important scene with the trajectories of objects. This play advantage scale functions as a real-time guide for adjusting the speed for the playback of the trajectory. Claims 1 and 10 have also been amended to further include means for controlling the speed at which trajectories of the objects are displayed. No new matter is being entered by this amendment, as original disclosure may be found in the specification at page 9, lines 5-20 and page 14, lines 14-21 and Figure 5. It is respectfully requested that this amendment could not have been earlier

made as it is being made for clarification purposes, particularly in traversal of the Examiner's Final rejection of Claims 3 and 4 as being anticipated by Tamir.

Respectfully, Tamir does not teach such a play advantage scale for representing an important scene with said trajectories, the scale functioning as a guide for adjusting the speed for the playback of the trajectory. This is a valuable function in that it affords a user to fast forward through unimportant plays captured by the video, and in real time, hone in on a play that is important, e.g., play leading to scoring a goal in a football game, the importance of the play being measured according to a scale, e.g., a numerical value, which is displayed concurrent with the trajectory view.

In his rejection of Claim 3, the Examiner alleges that Tamir teaches how speed of trajectories may be controlled (cites Tamir at Col. 7, lines 32-37) and, in his rejection of Claim 4, alleges that Tamir teaches how a play advantage scale is provided that represents an important scene (cites Tamir's image analyzer and Col. 7, lines 16-21). While the tracking of past object movement is provided in Tamir to form a trajectory overlayed with the video contents, there is no discussion how the speed of trajectories in the video display, per se, are controllable. In the first instance, Tamir does not provide a separate trajectory view separate from the video content images. While Tamir teaches typical video editing capability, such as fast forward functionality, this is not the same as controlling a speed of the object's trajectory which in the invention, involves frame skipping, in order to achieve faster replay (e.g., faster than the video rate), and in a manner such as to avoid an odd sensation for a viewer (See present specification on page 14, lines 4-10). There is no mention in Tamir that the speed of the tracked objects, per se, may be independently controlled. In fact, in Tamir, a created trajectory of past player movement is

described as being superimposed on the video image as described in Tamir's description of Figure 2 which is a sample display of a video frame including a highlighted player and which provides only an indication of the past trajectory of a highlighted player. While mere fast forwarding capability is provided in Tamir as the Examiner apparently suggests, there is no intelligence built-in (e.g., play advantage scale) to provide a guide for a user to hone in on important video scenes in the manner as provided in the present invention and now claimed in amended Claims 1 and 10. In fact the image analyzer, cited in support of the rejection of Claim 4 (now in Claim 1), is a hardware device implementing a real-time motion estimation chip (See Col. 8, lines 24-29) that is able to manipulate a sequence of digital images, in connection with tracking and highlighting objects for superposition on the video image and the creation of a wide field of view from smaller view FOVs by mosaicking functionality. There is no teaching of a play advantage scale for guiding users to control trajectory speed of objects so that user may skip less important scenes in high-speed fast-forwarding of trajectories (view).

Respectfully, as Tamir does not teach or suggest any of the limitations of canceled Claims 3 and 4 (now incorporated in independent Claims 1 and 10 as amended), Tamir can not be anticipatory, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1 and 10 as amended herein, and further the rejections of all Claims dependent thereon.

In view of the foregoing remarks herein, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with the Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of

this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman

Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
SF:gc

**OFFICIAL**

**FAX RECEIVE**

**AUG 21 2003**

**GROUP 210**